

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Figures 3 and 4 have been amended to correct minor informalities. Marked-up and formal copies are enclosed.

### **REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 9-19 and 21-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9-12, 15, 16 and 21 have been amended, and claims 7, 8 and 20 have been cancelled by the present Amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 16-20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of Hagting et al.; and claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 15, 21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of Hagting et al. and Zeira et al.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 16-20 and 22 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim et al. in view of Hagting et al. This rejection is respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a combination of features and has been amended to recite that the reverting step further includes checking whether the reply signal is received within a second time duration that is shorter than the first time duration and retransmitting the radio link set completion message when the reply signal is not received within the second time duration. Independent claims 4, 11 and 16 include similar features in a varying scope.

These features are supported at least by Figure 4 and the corresponding description of the specification. For example, Figure 4 illustrates not receiving a reply signal in response to the radio link set completion message before the expiration of the second time period (see the signal RLC\_ACK 102). As shown, the radio link set completion message is then retransmitted.

The Office Action indicates Kim et al. teach retransmitting a radio link set completion message when the reply signal is not received and cites Figure 15. However, it is respectfully noted step 1505 in Figure 15 of Kim et al. does not correspond to a retransmission step. Rather, step 1505 corresponds to determining whether a response has been received and continuously looping if no response is received. There is no description in Kim et al. about retransmitting a radio link set-up request in step 1504. Further, it is respectfully noted the transmitted radio link set-up request message in step 1504 does not correspond to the claimed radio link set completion message of the present invention. Hagting et al. does not teach or suggest these features.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 4, 11 and 16 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the other rejections have also been overcome as the claims rejected therein are dependent claims and Zeira et al. also do not teach or suggest the features of the independent claims.

In addition, Figures 3 and 4 have been amended to correct minor spelling errors.

**Conclusion**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact David A. Bilodeau. (Reg. No. 42,325) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By

Scott L. Lowe

Registration No.: 41,458

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

# FIG. 3

BACKGROUND ART




FIG. 4

